

## CYBERSECURITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Virtual Meeting

Thursday, December 11, 2025, 2:00 PM

### 1. **Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call – Melissa Gutierrez**

Ms. Gutierrez called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **Members Present**

Jason Johnson, Chair, Deputy CIO, DoIT  
Raja Sambandam, State CISO, OCS  
Dr. Lorie Liebrock, Director, NM Cybersecurity Center of Excellence  
Cassandra Hayne, CIO, AOC  
Dr. Brad Purdy, CIO, SOS  
Tim Presley, CIO, Tesuque Casino  
Robert Benavidez, CIO, Bernalillo County  
Bill York, CSO, DOH

#### **Members Absent**

Regina Chacon, Deputy Secretary, DHSEM  
Mark Leech, Director/CIO, City of Albuquerque  
Michael Good, CIO, Los Lunas School District  
Major General Miguel Aguilar, Department of Military Affairs  
Dr. Srinivas Mukkamala, CEO, Securin, Inc.  
Senator Michael Padilla, State Senator

#### **OTHERS PRESENT**

Manny Barreras, DoIT Cabinet Secretary and State CIO  
Melissa Gutierrez, OCS Cybersecurity Business Analyst  
Todd Baran, OCS General Counsel  
Bryan Brock, OCS Contract Counsel  
Flori Martinez (OCS), Dan Garcia (OCS), Joshua Yadao (Deloitte), Brandon Flen (ENMU IT Mgr.), Hogan Peters (Deloitte), Anthony Ballo (CABQ), Doris Aoun (SailPoint Acct. Exec.) Rodney Chavez (CISO, NM ENV), John Ryon (Fortinet), Demetrius Brandon (CISO, NM-PED/ENMU), Hunter Salazar (NM Board of Nursing), William Campos (Deloitte), Todd Hochman (ENV), Caleb Raymer (EMNRD), Del Ameko (CISO, ThetaPoint Inc.), Dave Jackson (interested public attendee)

### 2. **Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION:** Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the Agenda. Dr. Liebrock so moved, seconded by Mr. Presley. Ms. Gutierrez requested that Item 5 b, Third Party Risk Management, be moved to the first position under Item 5 in order to accommodate Mr. Baran's schedule. There being no opposition to this change the Agenda was approved.

### 3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**MOTION:** Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 13, 2025 meeting with the change of member Brad Purdy to Dr. Bradley Purdy, and all additional references in the minutes changed to Dr. Purdy. Dr. Liebrock so moved, seconded by Mr. Presley. There being no opposition the motion passed. Ms. Gutierrez noted that for reference purposes, titles and affiliations of Committee members will be added to the Roll Call section of the minutes moving forward.

### 4. **Action Item – Discussion and vote on purchase of KnowBe4 Training Licenses for HEI's**

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she had sent out a budget summary of the dollar amount available for Year One for training, adding that \$250,000.00 was allocated for this project. She reviewed the purchase of licenses in January 2025 for \$71,000.00, and that in July this was opened again for new entities to apply with the purchase of additional licenses in the amount of \$69,000.00. The new request is to

purchase licenses starting in January 2026, for \$51,000.00. She explained that these licenses are for end users at K-12, higher education, counties, municipalities, any of these entities which have applied, and these licenses will be valid until July 30, 2026, meaning that this new request will give higher education institutions licenses through June 2026, with the expectation that with Year Two funding another round of these licenses will be made available for entities to join this particular service and project. She noted that some higher education institutions had already purchased KnowBe4 licenses so these entities will not be included in future license purchases. She stated that the total number of licenses to purchase in this request is 21,780, which will be allocated to various colleges. She explained that the Office of Cybersecurity is working on a project regarding support for Microsoft licenses, which is not under the SLCGP, and is a very separate legislative appropriation. However, through work on this project interest has been garnered in the KnowBe4 program for these other entities. She then called for further comments, questions, concerns and discussion.

Dr. Purdy commented that this is a great tool. He noted that Mr. Sambandam had reported about seven counties being provided cybersecurity awareness training in a recent presentation to the LFC and queried if that was through these licenses and whether additional licenses would be available to add more counties if they so choose. Mr. Sambandam replied that OCS is open to onboarding more local governments in this process, however, this has to go through the SLCGP funding requirements process. Mr. Sambandam asked Ms. Gutierrez for further clarification.

Ms. Gutierrez explained that this project was originally opened in 2024 to counties and municipalities, with a new application period opened in March 2025, with more applications received, so another purchase of licenses, for the \$69,000.00 in the report. She stated that with this new request the consent forms from higher education would not be needed because in the NOFO for this particular grant higher education institutions are considered state agencies, with the state being allowed to use 15% of the total award for that year on a state purchase or state project. She noted that of the \$2.5 million available for this, the request is for only \$381,000.00, so to date the remaining balance is \$77,000.00, with the current request being \$51,000.00. She gave further details about opening another application period and the requirement for signing the consent form.

Dr. Purdy asked if an informational flyer describing the types of services this grant can support could be provided, similar to what Mr. Sambandam provided to the Legislative Services, which could help some of the smaller counties. Mr. Sambandam described the process of announcing the application process, which would be sent out to local governments using the current contact list OCS has established. He added that this would also be presented to IT affiliates, through county and municipal representation on the Advisory Committee, which is then taken to the Association of Counties and cascaded down further. Mr. Sambandam asked Ms. Gutierrez if there were any other avenues he did not include. Ms. Gutierrez concurred that these are the usual contacts. She gave a further explanation of the need for the new application period for Dr. Purdy, as he was not a Committee member at that time. She stated that there will be a remaining balance of \$58,000.00, so if it is the Committee's wish to move forward with another application period this can definitely be done. Dr. Purdy suggested additional notification could be done through the representation on this Committee taking the information to their respective stakeholders, noting that he has additional contacts through the County Clerk's office in each county. Dr. Purdy also noted other services offered by OCS, such as vulnerability scanning and the replacement for NCSR, which would be beneficial to counties. Mr. Sambandam stated that there is a one page document which can be updated with the status of NCSR and MS-ISAC, and that Dr. Purdy's contact list with County Clerk offices could be included to broaden the reach of information dissemination.

Mr. Sambandam described the tight integration between Microsoft and KnowBe4, taken into consideration in the selection process, which was well received within the higher education community as they are on the same platform within the Microsoft ecosystem. He added that possible integration aspects can be explored through the vendor by local IT affiliates to gain efficiencies with the product they are using.

Dr. Purdy stated that his team will be asking OCS to help them integrate to Wiser and KnowBe4, both are great products and the idea of being integrated and having that link is a great option.

Dr. Liebrock commented that the Engagement Committee has done the same kind of outreach mentioned by Dr. Purdy, with each member, representing the component of their respective industry, which for her is K-12 and higher education, and Mr. Presley working with the native communities, and they will certainly continue that and have Dr. Purdy also engage.

**MOTION:** Dr. Liebrock moved that the Committee move forward on the purchase of KnowBe4 training licenses for higher education and K-12. Mr. Presley seconded the motion. Chair Johnson called for additional discussion.

Ms. Gutierrez asked for clarification of the motion, noting that Dr. Liebrock stated for higher education and K-12, and the original ask was just for higher education institutions. Dr. Liebrock stated that NMMI is listed and asked if they are classified as higher education, noting that New Mexico Military Institute (NMMI) is also a high school. Ms. Gutierrez thanked Dr. Liebrock for noting this, that NMMI is classified as both.

Chair Johnson suggested that the motion be modified to state that the KnowBe4 licenses will be for the entities listed on the document presented. Dr. Liebrock agreed to this change to her motion. Mr. Presley again seconded this motion. Chair Johnson called for any additional discussion. Mr. Brandon from ENMU stated that they are currently using KnowBe4 acquired through the State and are not on this list. Dr. Liebrock stated that New Mexico Tech is also doing this, but had already paid for it, which is likely the same situation for ENMU, and this license request is for new licenses. Mr. Brandon stated that they did not pay for it, they received it through the grant. Dr. Liebrock clarified that ENMU began under the earlier licenses and this is for new application licenses. Mr. Brandon thanked Dr. Liebrock for the clarification. Dr. Liebrock asked Ms. Gutierrez to confirm her explanation. Ms. Gutierrez confirmed this and thanked Dr. Liebrock. Chair Johnson stated that these licenses are to expand to other entities. Chair Johnson again called for questions or comments.

Chair Johnson called for any opposition to the motion. There being none, Chair Johnson stated the motion carried to approve expansion of the KnowBe4 licenses for the entities listed in the document presented.

## **5. Updates from State CISO, Raja Sambandam**

(Item “b” was not presented at this time as previously requested as Mr. Baran had to leave the meeting temporarily. He will report on Item “b” when he is able to rejoin the meeting)

### **a. MS-ISAC – Raja Sambandam**

Mr. Sambandam reported that some terms and conditions had to be updated on the MS-ISAC agreement, which has been done, and this has been submitted to DFA. They are currently awaiting DFA approval in order to proceed with necessary procurement steps. He noted that there was a price increase due to the required updates and changes in the agreement, which necessitated adjustments to that process. Mr. Sambandam called for questions.

Dr. Purdy commented that this was great news.

Mr. Sambandam added that these changes and the resubmission has delayed the approval which he hoped would occur within the next couple of weeks, but due to the holidays may not be received until January. He will provide updates on this as they are available.

Dr. Purdy had a question about services available to the counties, particularly the IDS systems, the Albert sensors, which is already in use by several counties, and whether help to continue these IDS services will be available as part of this grant or other OCS services. Mr. Sambandam stated with the statewide MS-ISAC telemetry will be monitored as the first level of difference by the Center for Internet

Security, especially for MDVR blocking services. He added that since there are counties which may have their own Albert sensors there will be a need to examine this from an architectural perspective to see how the telemetry from those sensors can be incorporated into the state reporting mechanism. Dr. Purdy stated a reminder that MS-ISAC is now charging for the Alberts sensors, and Mr. Sambandam replied, yes, he was aware and this situation will need to be examined and addressed. Further discussion ensued between Dr. Purdy and Mr. Sambandam regarding the details of this issue. Mr. Sambandam noted that there may be another option which could be explored through the Homeland Security Grant, which has a cybersecurity component, if the majority of counties are willing to participate, with the support of the Office of the Secretary of State and OCS. Mr. Purdy agreed that this might be a good option and thanked Mr. Sambandam for bringing this up.

b. Third Party Risk Management – Todd Baran

Report on Item “b” began after the transfer of the Chair as noted below following Item “c”.

Mr. Sambandam introduced this item by stating that the management of the third party risk within the state IT ecosystem is currently fragmented and weak. He added that many of the cybersecurity threats are manifesting through vendors who provide their services or products to the State IT ecosystem. This has recently become an issue that needs to be mitigated in some way and some funding has been requested for this. He then asked Mr. Baran to give more details.

Mr. Baran stated that vendor risk is essentially the risk of OCS. He added that currently there are no formal requirements for public entities to follow to mitigate vendor risk in those relationships, with vendors providing critical services for the State, and individual entities managing this risk individually, which is a topic that has not been addressed very often or deeply. He described two pilot initiatives that will be taken into the next legislative session, and beyond. One of these will be a scorecard process, where reports will be received on the vendors doing business with the State, which will give that vendor’s risk score or posture from a standard baseline. This will not be specific to New Mexico or the project, but will be a collection of publicly available information which will help determine whether that vendor is an entity to be concerned about in contract considerations. As part of this pilot there will hopefully be some engagement with vendors considered high risk to address concerns that have been discovered, however, there is no legal requirement that they cooperate with this process. The second approach is more multifaceted and tailors the assessment to both the State at a high level and to the specific projects at a micro-level. The criticality of the project will be weighed against the risk exposure of the vendor, determined by an assessment which is standardized, but can address the specific risks of the project. Within this initiative there will also be efforts to reform the contracting processes to include relevant cybersecurity controls and protections in the contracts with the vendors, such as reporting breaches, maintaining compliance with minimum standards, etc. This will be a more comprehensive and effective way of managing third party risk, but it will entail a large operational shift in focus as well as increased effort. This would include a risk assessment for each project as well as the preferred vendor, for every major procurement, which may not be operationally feasible given the current resources available. These are the processes being explored. Google will be backing this second initiative and another national company doing the scorecard for the first approach described. He then returned the discussion back to Mr. Sambandam.

Mr. Sambandam stated this has been a legislative ask for them to have some visibility into the third party risk, so these pilot programs are being initiated. He stated more details will be shared as these become available. He asked if there were any questions about this. There was a question in the chat about TX-RAMP or Fed-RAMP. Mr. Sambandam stated this would not be like those. He added that some vendors are qualified through State-RAMP and some through Fed-RAMP, and the vendor currently being discussed for the pilot is a Fed-RAMP certified vendor.

Dr. Purdy asked if the name of the vendor could be shared at this time. Mr. Sambandam stated that he believed the contract had not been signed yet, so this information will hopefully be shared at the next meeting. He asked Mr. Baran to confirm this. Mr. Baran responded that this is correct.

Dr. Purdy recommended that while putting together the overall package they consider that CIS has their own evaluation for cloud services and applications which they have been pushing for a number of years, and sounds like a good analysis. Mr. Sambandam thanked Dr. Purdy and stated this will be taken into consideration, however, the hope is that going through the pilot will identify potential gaps in the process. Mr. Sambandam gave further background details regarding these processes with additional comments by Dr. Purdy regarding risk management relative to IT and cybersecurity. Ms. Gutierrez offered to provide additional specific information to Dr. Purdy.

c. FY2027 Budget Request – Raja Sambandam

Mr. Sambandam reported that as OCS is administratively attached to DoIT, the OCS budget was submitted thanks to the DoIT Secretary, through the Executive Branch to the Legislature. This budget is well within the same range as last year, including specials and recurring items, and is approximately \$31 million. Mr. Sambandam explained the reasons why this budget includes special as well as recurring funding items, stating that since the function of OCS was established in 2023, and since programs using special funding at that time have become operational, these items will need to be moved to operational funding.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that there is approximately \$1.8 million being requested as the cost share requirement for the SLCGP, which will be part of the operational allocation to ensure this funding cannot be included in federal or special funding. Mr. Sambandam thanked her for this input. He added that the original SLCGP grant was for four years and waivers for the state cost share for Year 1 and Year 2 were granted by CISA and FEMA, however, the waiver for Year 3 was denied and this cost share amount is +/- \$1.8 million. This amount was included in the recurring budget as these projects could extend beyond 2028, and specials expire within one or two years.

Dr. Purdy commented that when his office appeared before the LFC it was recommended that they work closely with OCS, and that the OCS presentation made a very favorable impression on this Committee. Mr. Sambandam thanked Dr. Purdy for his comment.

Dr. Purdy asked if OCS will remain under DoIT or if it will become an independent agency. Mr. Sambandam explained that OCS will remain under DoIT at this time, but this could change in the future with administrative changes, etc. Mr. Purdy thanked him for this update.

**Chair Johnson transferred the Chair to Mr. Sambandam at this point for continuity of the meeting as he was in transit and would have intermittent connection. However, he would remain on the call as best he could. He asked if there were any objections to this transfer and there were none.**

**6. Updates on SLCGP Year 1 Project**

- a. Project 1 – Policy Development (no updates)
- b. Project 2 – NCSR – project closed (no updates)
- c. Project 3 – ASM and VMAS – project ongoing (no updates)
- d. Project 4 – Cybersecurity Training – project ongoing (no updates)
- e. Project 5 – Cybersecurity Workforce Development Planning – Bryan Brock

Mr. Brock reported that there were 17 responses to the RFQ. He thanked the Committee for their work with OCS on development of this RFQ, which was much better as a result of this work. He stated that per the Committee's request the OCS team has reviewed these responses and they are recommending five companies to be interviewed. He noted that Ms. Gutierrez is managing the interview scheduling process, with calendar invitations to be sent out to members of the Committee once dates and times have been determined. He encouraged all Committee members to attend and participate. He added that the submission from each of these five companies will also be shared with Committee members by Ms. Gutierrez for review prior to these interviews. These interviews will be recorded and made available to Committee members for further review at their convenience. He reported that the OCS team hopes to bring a recommendation to the Committee sometime in January.

Dr. Liebrock asked Ms. Gutierrez if four of these interviews have already been scheduled. Ms.

Gutierrez confirmed that this is correct. Dr. Liebrock then asked when the documents would be sent out prior to these scheduled interviews. Ms. Gutierrez replied that she hoped to get those sent out today after this meeting, and these will be links to the files of the quote submissions. Ms. Gutierrez noted that she had not included all Committee members in the invitations to the interviews, only those members who had worked specifically on the RFQ, and that in the email sent out with the links to the submission documents she had asked those not receiving an invitation but interested in attending to let her know so they can be included, but there is a need to be mindful of the quorum issue. Ms. Gutierrez stated that access to the recordings will be shared with all Committee members. Dr. Liebrock thanked Ms. Gutierrez for this information.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there were any further questions regarding this project.

Mr. Sambandam commented that he had been monitoring some of the legislative proceedings, specifically the LFC, and they had some questions related to Workforce Development and the work that the higher education department is doing. He queried what those initiatives are and if some of these can be understood and whether OCS can be in a position to capture some of this as part of the outcome of the OCS efforts, which could help connect some of these initiatives occurring throughout the State system.

Mr. Brock stated that the RFQ includes a requirement for vendors to work with the higher education department to take advantage of the work they are already doing in order to work together to improve the workforce development opportunities around the state, so this is part of the current scope of work and one of the most valuable parts of the project. Mr. Sambandam responded that he is open to any avenues which may provide additional subject matter expertise.

Mr. Sambandam reported that the LFC proceedings also referenced the dual credit programs, specifically related to the immediate need in healthcare, cyber and quantum.

Dr. Liebrock stated that dual credit is not new, however, what is new is that this year is the first year that the higher education institutions have been funded for offering these courses. Mr. Sambandam responded that he now understands that these are transitioning from unfunded mandates to more funded mandates. Dr. Liebrock gave the example of this being the first year that NM Tech will have their first applied cybersecurity sequence offered as dual credit in the hybrid mode. She added that there are a number of institutions who had been trying to do this and now there is funding to reimburse part of the cost. Mr. Sambandam asked if these are two year or four year programs. Dr. Liebrock described that dual credits are credits students can use toward their high school diploma and their college degree and in some schools which are Early College High Schools they can earn their associates degree by the time they graduate from high school, but in other schools those credits become part of their undergraduate curriculum and are applied according to State rules, with courses varying greatly across the State with respect to what is being offered. Dr. Liebrock stated that these courses do have to meet college credit requirements. Mr. Sambandam asked if a certification is done as part of their course work would this be included or would it have to be a college level course. Dr. Liebrock replied that it must be a college level course, such as their Applied Cybersecurity Course, which is a freshman sequence, and the high schools they are working with will pay for the students to take the Security Plus Certification at the end of the class. She added that in this scenario, if students go on to college they will have four college credits, but if they do not go to college and they do well, they will have earned the Security Plus Certification. She added that this is not only affecting NM Tech, but having a major impact across the State. Mr. Sambandam thanked Dr. Liebrock for this information and clarification.

## **7. Update from Engagement Subcommittee:**

### **a. Cybersecurity Plan Updates – Deloitte – Will Campos**

Mr. Campos reported that the Deloitte team has been meeting with the Engagement Subcommittee weekly or every other week to update the Statewide Cybersecurity Plan. He noted that the initial Plan was drafted in 2023 and this work is to refine and update that Plan. Their current work is focusing on

the four goals listed in the Plan, refining the objectives of these goals. Once these have been updated the goal is to use these as a guide to select the projects for the SLCGP Year Two grant funds. He stated that a draft copy has now been provided to the Engagement Subcommittee members for review to be discussed at upcoming December meetings, the next of which is scheduled for tomorrow, 12/12/2025. The goal is to have a draft copy available to the full Committee in January with approval soon to follow.

Mr. Campos asked Mr. Benavidez, Chair of this Subcommittee, if he had anything further to add. Mr. Benavidez stated that Mr. Campos had covered this well.

Mr. Campos asked if there were any questions from the rest of the Committee. There were none.

## **8. Member Comment(s):**

Mr. Sambandam asked if there should be future discussion of AI and other emerging technologies, and the risks associated with these, either for general discussion in this forum or to be included as emerging threats within the Cybersecurity Plan.

Dr. Liebrock agreed that this is something this Committee should examine as it is becoming a huge risk factor as these technologies are becoming integrated in so many places. She added that in her work with related state agencies she has observed how AI is having a major impact on privacy, which presents additional risk.

Mr. Sambandam asked if Dr. Liebrock would suggest approaching the issue from a privacy viewpoint.

Dr. Liebrock responded that this could be approached from possibly three perspectives; one being the new risks associated with the AI, which makes attacks by hackers much easier, secondly, AI has also introduced a lot of new privacy risks where current controls are not adequate, and thirdly, AI does have the potential to actually help in some cases. She suggested that there may be a need for a Subcommittee to explore the impact AI has on the SLCGP and statewide cybersecurity. Mr. Sambandam replied that these are good suggestions.

Mr. Johnson commented that there is an AI awareness campaign being initiated through the KnowBe4 training, and this addresses how AI has made phishing more realistic and the risks associated with that, reinforcing the need for continued vigilance.

Mr. Johnson asked Dr. Liebrock when her last day on this Committee would be. Dr. Liebrock stated it would be this month. Dr. Liebrock replied that her retirement date from NM Tech is the end of December, however, no replacement has yet been hired.

Mr. Johnson stated he would like to recognize Dr. Liebrock's participation, her knowledge and expertise, in helping move the work of this Committee forward. He thanked Dr. Liebrock for her work here and how he has appreciated working with her. He wished Dr. Liebrock the very best moving forward. Dr. Liebrock thanked Mr. Johnson.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that Dr. Liebrock has been excellent in every aspect of the work of this Committee, and stated she would welcome her "volunteer time" if she would so choose. Dr. Liebrock stated she has been granted emeritus status by the regents of NM Tech, so her email address will remain active. Mr. Sambandam and Mr. Johnson congratulated Dr. Liebrock for this. Mr. Sambandam added his appreciation for all of Dr. Liebrock's work and participation with this Committee and OCS.

Mr. Sambandam stated that to his earlier comment about AI, he was approaching this from a risk perspective and OCS has the privacy and data protections within the legal realm. He commented that he had wanted to let the saturation of the AI issues die down a bit, which seems to be occurring, so this may be the time to look at the potential risks and consequences of AI relevant to data security/privacy

aspects, and what can be leveraged through the existing cybersecurity controls, or if something new should be explored.

Dr. Purdy noted that the discussion about AI has a tendency to cause people to become anxious when questioned and the potential for imposing controls. He encouraged awareness of managed risks leveraged against benefits. He noted Dr. Liebrock's previous comment regarding the benefits, one of which was asking why people are using AI and why they want to continue to use it, with managed risks that do not stifle or try to stop benefits, so benefits can be realized without adding detrimental effects.

Mr. Sambandam agreed that there should not be any hindrance to advancement of technology, however, this should be within the guardrails of securing the environment of digital assets. He thanked Dr. Purdy for his comments.

**9. Public Comment(s)**

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there were any nonmembers present who would like to comment on items within the purview of this Committee, avoiding specific cyber sensitive information. There were none.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:** Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to adjourn. Dr. Liebrock so moved, seconded by Mr. Presley. There being no objection and no further business before the Committee the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

DocuSigned by:



17D63C4A596D447...